

REMARKS

Claims pending in the instant application are numbered 37-72. Claims 37-72 presently stand rejected. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 37-43 and 45-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam, U.S. 6,081,900, in view of Farah, "Encrypted Hypertext Transfer Protocol – UGGC/1.0", April 2000, Network Working Group. Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam, in view of Farah, and further in view of Gampper, U.S. 6,502,106.

Claim 37 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

"receiving a first request from a terminal behind a firewall at a secure server outside of the firewall,

...

modifying an address associated with the retrieved web page by the secure server so that the secure server appears to be the source of the web page and the firewall is unable to determine the address associated with the retrieved web page; and

encrypting the content of the retrieved web page by the secure server and sending the encrypted web page by the secure server, via a secure link, to the terminal, wherein the firewall is unable to decrypt the encrypted content of the retrieved web page."

Subramaniam is directed to secure access of a network from an external client (Abstract).

External client 112 is outside the security parameter 102 of secure network 100 (Figure 1; col. 6, lines 46-49). Security parameter 102 is defined by firewall software (col. 4, lines 53-56).

Subramaniam does not disclose that external client 112 is behind a firewall. Figure 1 shows security parameter 102 surrounding target server 104 and border server 106.

Further, Subramaniam is directed to external client 112 gaining secure access to target server 104 inside secure network 100. In contrast, the Applicant claims that a terminal behind a firewall is communicating outside of that firewall to access a server outside of the firewall. Subramaniam fails to disclose that a firewall protecting such a terminal cannot decrypt an encrypted web page address nor decrypt encrypted data passing through the firewall to the terminal. Thus, Subramaniam fails to disclose or suggest “receiving a first request from a terminal behind a firewall” “the firewall is unable to determine the address associated with the retrieved web page” and “wherein the firewall is unable to decrypt the encrypted content of the retrieved web page” as claimed by the Applicant.

Farah also fails to disclose the above highlighted claim limitations.

Thus, Subramaniam and Farah, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 37. Accordingly, claim 37 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Independent claims 48, 52, 55, 60, 65 and 70 distinguish for at least the same reasons as claim 37. Claims 38-47, 49-51, 53-54, 56-59,

61-64, 66-69 and 71-72 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claims in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that in view of the remarks and amendments set forth herein, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance in this case.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,
~~BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN~~

Date: Sept. 14, 2005


Anthony H. Azure
Reg. No. 52,580
Phone: (206) 292-8600 x311